## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-36, 38-50, and 52-59 are presently pending, of which claims 1, 30, and 44 are independent. Claims 1, 44, 56, and 59 are amended herein. Applicants believe that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance as discussed below. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the comments set forth below.

## I.      Claim Objections

Claim 56 is amended herein to address the Examiner's objection. Claim 56 is amended to recite a "computer readable storage medium" to match the computer readable storage medium of claim 1, from which claim 56 depends. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment addresses the Examiner's objection, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 56.

## II.     Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3-6, 25, 28, 30-33, 36, 42-47, and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Published Patent Application 2003/0001896 to Johnson (hereafter "Johnson"). Although not explicitly recited in the Office Action, it appears that the Examiner also rejects claims 56-59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson (Office Action at pages 11-12). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

### A.      Claim 1, 3-6, 25, 28, and 56

Independent claim 1 recites:

1.      A computer readable storage medium storing computer executable instructions that when executed on a processor manage a graphical interface, the medium storing:
      instructions for providing a graphical interface, a hardware device and a software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the software device being accessible to a computer;
      ***instructions for providing at least one interactive hardware object accessible to the computer, where the hardware object represents the hardware***

*device and is depicted in the graphical interface, the hardware object interacting with the hardware device*;

instructions for providing a software object, wherein the software object is representative of the software device, where the software object is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device;

*instructions for receiving, from a user, a plurality of configurations of the hardware device, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object*; and

*instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson fails to disclose at least *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

The Examiner argues that the channel configuration panel of Johnson constitutes a disclosure of "displaying the plurality of device configurations simultaneously." In particular, the Examiner states:

> *"the GUI may display a third panel, e.g., a channel configuration panel, which presents options for specifying values of one or more parameters for the indicated channel(s)"* (emphasis added). Figure 26 of Johnson shows an example displaying the plurality of device configurations simultaneously.

(Office Action at page 4, italics in original)

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Johnson for at least two reasons.

First, the cited passages of Johnson describing the Channel Configuration Panel and the Device Settings Panel do not show *a plurality of configurations simultaneously*. In Johnson, each "channel" represents a terminal <u>of the measurement device</u> (Johnson at paragraph [0016]). Therefore in Johnson, a terminal is a *part* of a hardware device, and the channel that represents the terminal is a *part* of a hardware object. (Johnson at paragraphs [0016]-[0017]). The channel settings that may be set by a user within the Channel Configuration Panel collectively represent *a single configuration* for the target hardware object, even when multiple channels make up part of the target device. Since Johnson does not disclose a plurality of configurations, there is no

reason for Johnson to disclose displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously. For at least this reason, Johnson does not disclose **display a plurality of configurations simultaneously**, as required by claim 1. Moreover, the Device Settings Panel of Johnson shown in Figure 26 (also cited by the Examiner) does not **display a plurality of configurations simultaneously**.

Second, the cited passages of Johnson do not disclose that **each configuration corresponds to <u>a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device</u>**, which is present in claim 1. The amendment to claim 1 clarifies that the plurality of configurations are all for a single <u>device</u>, and that <u>each</u> configuration is represented by a <u>unique hardware object</u>. As noted above, Johnson utilizes channels to represent only a part of a device which has a *single configuration*. Therefore, Johnson does not disclose that *each configuration* has a corresponding unique hardware object.

For at least the reasons identified above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

B.      <u>Claims 30-33, 36, 42-43, and 57</u>

Independent claim 30 recites:

30.      A method for managing an interface, the method comprising:
     providing a graphical interface, a hardware device and a software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the software device being accessible to a computer;
     providing at least one hardware object accessible to the computer, where the hardware object represents the hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, the hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;

providing at least one software object, representative of the software device, where the software object is depicted in the graphical interface, and is configured to be interactive with the software device and;
*the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*; and
displaying the hardware object and the software object to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose at least *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*, which is present in claim 30. The Examiner argues that "Johnson provides an interface for changing various settings of a device. When a user makes a change to the device, that change is reflected in the graphical user interface (the graphical interface is updated)" (Office Action at pages 24-25). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner misconstrues Johnson.

In claim 30, the graphical interface is updated *in response to a <u>change</u> in the hardware object or the software object*. In contrast, the interface in Johnson is updated in response to *the user providing input to the interface specifying <u>how</u> to change the hardware object* (Johnson at paragraphs [0143]-[0148]). Thus, Johnson's interface is updated <u>before</u> a change in the hardware or software object, and not in <u>response</u> to a change in the hardware or software object as required by claim 30.

Therefore, Johnson does not disclose at least *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*, which is present in claim 30. Claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 depend from independent claim 30 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 30. Accordingly claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, 57 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 30-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

C.      **Claims 44-47, 50, and 58**

Independent claim 44 recites:

44.      A computing device comprising:
a storage medium for storing and a processor for processing:
a graphical interface, at least one hardware device and one software device being accessible through the graphical interface;

a plurality of hardware objects accessible to the computer, where each of the hardware objects represents a hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, each hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;

a plurality of software objects, each representative of a software device accessible to the computer, where each of the software objects is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device; and

***a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously.***

Applicants amend claim 44 to recite ***a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously***.  Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose this feature of independent claim 44.

Johnson does not allow <u>a plurality of the hardware and software objects</u>, and <u>a configuration of an object</u>, to be displayed in a single graphical interface <u>simultaneously</u>.

The Examiner argues, at page 25 of the Office Action (emphasis in original):

Johnson Figure 16 depicts a single graphical interface displaying the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects … Figure 18A shows the **same graphical interface** after channels have been selected, where users may view and edit configurations of the devices.

The Examiner cites two different passages from Johnson: Figure 16 and the corresponding text at paragraph [0136], which depicts and describes Johnson's Main Configuration Screen (Johnson at [0211]); and Figure 18A, which is described in paragraph [0220] of Johnson and depicts the Channel Configuration Screen.  Figures 16 and 18A of Johnson are shown at two different times, and thus do not display information ***simultaneously***, as recited in claim 44.  To get from the Main Configuration Screen shown in Figure 16 to the Channel Configuration Screen shown in Figure 18, a user must first select a channel, as shown in Figure 17, and then, *in response*, a new screen (Figure 18A) is shown (Johnson at paragraphs [0218]-[0220]).

Further, there is no software object depicted in either Figure 16 or Figure 18A, nor is one described in paragraph [0136] of Johnson. Claim 44 recites ***a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously***. Figures 16 and 18A show, at most, measurement devices and channels. The measurement devices are clearly hardware objects. However, the "channels" of Johnson are <u>not</u> software devices. The "channels" represent terminals of the measurement devices (Johnson at paragraph [0016]), and are thus a <u>part</u> of a *hardware device*. The present Application describes a software device as "a unit of code capable of receiving an input and/or sending an output" (Application at page 6). Examples of software devices include, but are not limited to, DLLs, objects, subroutines, and databases (Application at page 6). Because no software object is shown in the graphical interface of Johnson, Johnson does not ***display the plurality of hardware objects <u>and</u> the plurality of software objects***.

Therefore, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 44. Claims 45-47, 50, and 58 depend from independent claim 44 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 44. Accordingly claims 45-47, 50, and 58 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 44. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 44-47, 50, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

### D.      <u>Claim 59</u>

Independent claim 59 recites:

59.      A computer readable storage medium storing computer executable instructions that when executed on a processor manage a graphical interface, the medium storing:
        instructions for providing a graphical interface, at least one hardware device and one software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware device or the software device;
        instructions for providing a plurality of hardware objects accessible to the computer, where each of the hardware objects represents a hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, each hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;
        instructions for providing a plurality of software objects, each representative of a software device accessible to the computer, where each of the

software objects is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device;

instructions for providing a plurality of configurations of the hardware object, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object;

***instructions for displaying the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one of the plurality of configurations of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously***;

***instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of a configuration from the plurality of configurations***; and

instructions for communicating with the hardware device corresponding to the selected configuration using the selected configuration.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose at least ***instructions for displaying the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one of the plurality of configurations of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously***, which is present in claim 59. As noted above in relation to claim 44, Johnson does not show a plurality of hardware objects <u>and</u> a plurality of software objects <u>and</u> at least one configuration of a hardware object or a software object in a single graphical interface <u>simultaneously</u>.

Further, Johnson does not disclose ***instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of a configuration from the plurality of configurations***. In Johnson, the user does not *select* from a plurality of configurations. Instead, a user *defines* a set of parameters for a terminal of the device.

Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 59. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

### III.    Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

### A.    Claims 7, 8, 12-14, 34, 35, 38, 48, 49 and 52

Claims 7, 8, 12-14, 34, 35, 38, 48, 49 and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0035008 to Fuller et al. (hereafter "Fuller"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8 and 12-14 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*, or that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device,* which are present in claim 1.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest these features. Fuller discusses a system and method for querying message-based instruments, automatically and/or graphically parsing the responses, and generating code that encapsulates the connection/communication with the instrument and the parsing of the response, [0019]. Fuller does not provide *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*, but rather allows the user to enter only one configuration at a time. For example, Fuller at [0024] describes how "code may also be generated to call and execute the saved configuration." Thus, Fuller allows only a single configuration of a hardware or software object to be generated. Further, Fuller does not disclose or suggest that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 7, 8 and 12-14.

Claims 34, 35 and 38 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*, which is present in claim 30.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest this feature. As in Johnson, Fuller describes a system in which a user enters a change to be applied to the hardware object or the software object at the interface, and then the hardware object or the software object is updated in

response. (Fuller at [0021]). This is not the same as *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in a hardware or software object*.

Thus Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 34, 35 and 38.

Claims 48, 49 and 52 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface*, which is present in claim 44.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Fuller, like Johnson, may display a list view of available devices, but does not display *the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface*. (Fuller at [0020]; *see also* Fuller at Figures 3-8).

Thus Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 48, 49 and 52.

**B.    Claims 9 and 10**

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0001896 to Hsiung et al. (hereafter "Hsiung"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of*

*configurations simultaneously* and that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

Hsiung also does not disclose or suggest these features. Hsiung discusses a technique for processing information or data over a network of computers. Hsiung further discusses a system for monitoring and controlling a process, or both monitoring and controlling a process, [0007]. The system illustrated in Hsiung includes an input module for receiving a plurality of parameters from a process for manufacture of a substance or object. Hsiung does not discuss configuring a hardware object or a software object, and therefore Hsiung does not discuss *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* or that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Thus Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 9 and 10.

C.      **Claim 15**

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Fuller and Hsiung. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* and that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

As discussed above in II.A and II. B., Fuller and Hsiung each do not disclose or suggest this feature. Thus Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 15.

D.      **Claims 16-17, 27, 39, 40, 43, 53 and 54**

Claims 16-17, 27, 39, 40, 43, 53 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0004670 to Schmit et al. (hereafter "Schmit"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Schmit discusses one or more measurement devices comprising a measurement hardware device, a virtual measurement device or other type of device. (Schmit at [0013]). Schmit further indicates that a graphical user interface presents a list of available devices and corresponding channels appropriate for the indicated measurement type, where each of the channels corresponds to a terminal of a corresponding device. (Schmit at [0016]). Schmit further indicates that if the selected measurement type were voltage, the devices listed may be those devices available to the system which are suitable for measuring a voltage. (Schmit at [0136]).

Claims 16, 17 and 27 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* and that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device,* which are present in claim 1.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest these features. Schmit does not allow for *a plurality of* configurations of a hardware object or a software object to be displayed *simultaneously*. (Schmit at [0013]). On the contrary, Schmit states "the purpose [of the configuration tool architecture] is to present the user with the ability to configure exactly what their application does ... and then build a **single** task that encompasses all of this information." (Schmit at [0240]).

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 16, 17 and 27.

Claims 39, 40 and 43 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*, which is present in claim 30.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. As in Johnson and Fuller, Schmit describes a system in which a user enters a change to be applied to the hardware object or the software object at the interface, and then the hardware object or the software object is updated in response. (Fuller at [0013]). This is not the same as *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*.

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 39, 40 and 43.

Claims 53 and 54 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously*, which is present in claim 44.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Like Johnson and Fuller, Schmit is concerned with actually configuring the measurement devices based on user input, and not displaying a device's potential configurations. (Schmit at [0013]). As a result, Schmit does not *display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously*.

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 53 and 54.

E.    <u>Claims 18-24, 26, 41, 42 and 55</u>

Claims 18-24, 26, 41, 42 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Hsiung, and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0056018 to Pike et al. (hereafter "Pike").

Pike discusses receiving a first creation command from a user interface and establishing a communication channel linking the command interpreter and the control instrument independent of the interface bus or interface hardware driver type. (Pike at [0004]). Pike indicates a GUI that displays information regarding the configuration of the various communication channels the user may establish in response to user commands. (Pike at [0036]).

Claims 18-24 and 26 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* and that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device,* which are present in claim 1.

Pike also does not disclose or suggest these features. In particular, Pike does not disclose or suggest *displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*, where *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*. On the contrary, Pike states "the GUI 14 displays information regarding **the** configuration of the various communication channels the user 30 may establish in response to user commands" (Pike at [0036]).

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 18-24 and 26.

Claims 41 and 42 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*, which is present in claim 30.

Pike does not disclose or suggest this feature. Pike describes communicating with a device in order to configure it. (Pike at [0027]). Pike describes that the user enters configuration data and then communicates back and forth with the device in order to change the configuration of the device itself. Pike does not describe updating the graphical interface *in*

***response* to a change in the hardware object or the software object**, but rather updating the hardware object in response to a user command.

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 41 and 42.

Claim 55 depends from claim 44 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously*, which is present in claim 44.

Pike does not disclose or suggest this feature. Pike is concerned with establish *a* configuration of *a* device quickly and simply. (Pike at [0027]). Pike may list available devices (Pike at [0022]), but does not simultaneously show a configuration for any of those devices. Therefore, Pike does not display *the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously*.

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 55.

### F.     Claim 29

Claim 29 has been  rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,986,653 to Phathayakorn et al. (hereafter "Phathayakorn"). Claim 29 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* and that *each configuration corresponds to a hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

Phathayakorn discusses a method for signaling and acknowledging events associated with resource object organized in a foldable object tree displayed by a GUI. Phathayakorn further indicates that a foldable object tree allows a part of the tree to be folded into its parent object, (Col. 1, lines 55-60).

Phathayakorn also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Phathayakorn describes displaying data relating to signaling and acknowledging events associated with a resource object. (Phathayakorn at col. 1 lns. 55-60). Phathayakorn is concerned with the objects as they actually exist, not potential configurations that a user might want to select in the future. Therefore, Phathayakorn does not disclose *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*, or that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Thus Phathayakorn and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Phathayakorn in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 29.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

# CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-104. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: November 19, 2008                         Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Kevin J. Canning/
Kevin J. Canning
Registration No.: 35,470
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

-